

29 March 1968

Mr Weisberg:

Thanks for your letter of 24 March. The picture of Lovelady in his checkered shirt was not necessary-- it would have been impressive, but I learned that he had acknowledged in public (on CBS-TV, I think) that he was wearing that shirt on 22 Nov., and that was reference enough.

I have not ~~xxx~~ seen Similas, though I would like to. But I just wrote to a man in British Columbia who took movies on Dealey Plaza at the time of the assassination. I asked him to send me his film ~~his~~ and a letter describing what he remembers. The man offered his film to the Commission, but they refused to see it. I will let you know what comes of this.

I wrote to Sprague a few months ago, but have not received a reply.

My lecture was a sensation. I had planned it to last about two hours, but I fielded questions for two hours beyond that. I was exhausted, but gratified because all went away asking the logical question: how in Hell did they suppose that they could get away with such a blatant fraud? Some people approached me afterward and confided that I had truly terrified them. Good! There is reason for feeling terror.

Most of all, I was glad to be able to do something. I have been sitting here for a year wringing my hands, furious with a sense of impotence. Now at least I have company in my alarm, and a good many more people are concerned than were concerned before.

The timing of the lecture was good for the audience, not so good for me. We are approaching the end of the school year, and people will have time during the summer to read the Report in the light of what they now know, and probably also get some of the critics' books. But it was a bad time for my outburst, since I am busy with exams, term papers, and the like. What the Hell; one can't dictate the timing of his catharsis-- that's exactly what it was for me. It wasn't all that bad, in any case; I know the subject well enough so that I can speak extemporaneously about it for as long as the occasion requires-- and I can field questions indeffinitely.

I entitled the lecture "The Assassination of the Warren Report: Justifiable Homicide?" The lecture hall seated 300, but was jammed even in all the standing room areas-- including the aisles. I was amazed at the amount of interest-- amazed and glad that people are not as indifferent as we think they are.

sometimes

I have appeared on radio five times since my speech; once on an interview show, three times fielding questions from listeners who phone in, and once talking with a person who pretended that he knew something, but knew nothing. Our station covers 100,000 bodies and minds.

~~Exxwas~~

2

I was briefly on TV once, but have been invited to be interviewed again later for a longer period. Moreover, I have three speaking engagements before smaller groups of 30 to 50 people at a time. More will come, I am sure.

I am hoping that word will spread that there is an "assassination buff" in Canada, and that I will get a chance to speak elsewhere than Kingston.

— u —

In spite of your assurance that the Hughes film pictured in Life (24 Nov 67) was not doctored, I am more than ever convinced that it was. I was willing to let the matter rest because the blue-shirted figure appears in all the frames of the film, but I got Josiah Thompson's book some time after you wrote, and I noted something that renewed my conviction.

In the chapter entitled "A Reconstruction" Thompson prints a few frames of the Hughes film before the TSBD comes into view. The pictures are remarkably clear. The last picture of Hughes' movie before the TSBD comes into view is on p.184; it shows the south wall of the Dal-Tex Building (same distance from Hughes as the TSBD) with such clarity that you can distinguish individual bricks on the wall. When the TSBD comes into view, the picture seems to have no focus at all, either near or far.

You report in PW that Hughes turned over his undeveloped film to the FBI, that they developed it and "studied" it before Hughes ever saw it. It is my notion that the FBI inserted the blue-shirted figure to cover up a picture of Oswald in the doorway, and then made successive copies of that part of the film until it became so blurry that the evidence of their doctoring is not apparent (also, they may have wished to obscure the second figure on the sixth floor, in the closed window just west of "Oswald's window").

I cannot believe that the blue-shirted figure is on anyone's shoulders near the northwest corner of Houston and Main, as you suggest; if she is there, then she must be standing on those shoulders, for she is far above others standing on the pavement in that area. That's quite a feat of acrobatics, just to watch the motorcade. The movie by F.M. Bell (in Thompson p.185, and in Life) may show all of the west side of Houston Street as the motorcade passed, and it undoubtedly shows all of the high part of the concrete structure as JFK's car turned the corner at Elm. I would love to see if the blue-shirted figure is in that movie.

I went to Cornell with a fellow who works with Thompson at Haverford College. I wrote and told him what I thought about the Hughes film being doctored, but have not yet had a reply.

If the picture was doctored, it can only have been the FBI who did it, for they developed it and were its sole possessors until they returned it to Hughes. And, if it was doctored, they did it specifically because they knew that Oswald was standing in the doorway.

Or is the blue-shirted figure just another one of those strange "coincidences" that haunt this case?

— u —

3
Here is another bit of fakery that I noticed recently. You remember, of course, that the Commission misnumbered and transposed Zapruder 314 and 315, and thereby created the impression that the President's head moved forward after the last shot, instead of backward. In his book Thompson prints two diagrams showing the double movement of the President's head; he placed the diagrams side by side and clearly illustrated the violent backward motion of the head. Well, Newsweek reviewed the book and printed Thompson's two diagrams in reverse order! The switch creates the same impression as the reversal of 314 and 315 in the Exhibits. ~~They wrote~~ Newsweek wrote the caption straight, noting Thompson's "backward movement theory" (or something like that). The juxtaposition of a proper caption and transposed diagrams makes Thompson look like a fool, for anybody can see that the President's head moves forward!

Another "printer's error", no doubt.

Don't be concerned about not being able to answer my letters; I know that you are travelling and busy, and I do not wish to crowd your time.

Please let me know if I can do anything for you.

Still,

Dick

Dick Bernabei